

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-22 and 26-31 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, 10, 16, 26, 29, 30, and 31 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 6, 10, 16, 26, 29, 30, and 31 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

***Claims 1-5***

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,292,895 to Baltzley ("Baltzley"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,923,754 to Angelo *et al.* ("Angelo"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,603,857 to Batten-Carew *et al.* ("Batten-Carew"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites at least "an encrypted header" that includes "access rules for the secured electronic file."

Baltzley discloses an encryption server comprising a database having a plurality of encrypted private keys and a plurality of public keys. (Baltzley, col. 4, ll. 47-50). Angelo discloses hybrid encryption through the use of a session key to encrypt a document, and subsequently encrypting the session key with a public key. (Angelo, col. 3, ll. 13-22). Batten-Carew discloses the controlled release of time-sensitive information

using a server that establishes access information for a specific future time. (Batten-Carew, abstract).

However, none Neither Baltzley, Angelo, or Batten-Carew are used by the Examiner in the Office Action to teach or suggest, nor do they teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, “access rules” that are stored in “an encrypted header,” as recited in claim 1. Applicant submits that the combination of Baltzley, Angelo, and Batten-Carew therefore does not render claim 1 obvious.

Claims 2-5 are also not obvious over the combination of Baltzley, Angelo, and Batten-Carew for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claims 6-9 and 26-29**

Claims 6-9 and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,892,306 to En-Seung *et al.* (“En-Seung”), in view of Batten-Carew, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,851,050 to Singhal *et al.* (“Singhal”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claims 6, 26, and 29, as amended, each recite at least, “a header portion that contains access rules for the electronic document.”

En-Seung teaches generating key information, which is sent to a user’s terminal and a copy stored at the host server. (En-Seung, col. 4, ll. 52-67). The user’s key is generated using this key information, and used to decrypt a temporary validation key in a

data header, which in turn is used to decrypt the body of digital content. (En-Seung, col. 5, ll. 6-28). However, En-Seung does not actually teach or suggest “access *rules*” in the header, as recited in the claims 6, 26, and 29, rather merely the temporary validation key.

Batten-Carew discloses the controlled release of time-sensitive information using a server that establishes access information for a specific future time. (Batten-Carew, abstract). The Examiner relies on Singhal as allegedly disclosing generating a new key only if one does not exist. (Office Action, p. 11 (citing Singhal, col. 18, ll. 30-60)).

Therefore, En-Seung, Batten-Carew, or Singhal, either alone or in combination, are not used by the Examiner in the Office Action to teach or suggest, nor do they teach or suggest, “access rules” that are stored in “an encrypted header,” as recited in claims 6, 26, and 29. Therefore, the Applicant submits that, as the combination of En-Seung, Batten-Carew, and Singhal does not teach or suggest this feature, the applied references do not render claims 6, 26, and 29 obvious.

Claims 7-9 are also not obvious over the combination of En-Seung, Batten-Carew, and Singhal for at least the same reasons as independent claim 6, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Claims 27 and 28 are also not obvious over the combination of En-Seung, Batten-Carew, and Singhal for at least the same reasons as independent claim 26, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 6-9 and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claims 10-22, 30, and 31**

Claims 10-22, 30, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over En-Seung in view of Batten-Carew. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claims 10, 16, 30, and 31, as amended, each recite, using respective language, at least “a header portion that contains access rules for the electronic document.”

As previously noted with regard to similar distinguishing features, using respective language, in claims 6-9 and 26-29, En-Seung and Batten-Carew do not teach or suggest the presence of access rules in a header portion. Therefore, Applicant submits that for similar reasons as discussed above for claims 6-9 and 26-29, the combination of En-Seung and Batten-Carew does not teach or suggest at least this feature for claims 10, 16, 30, and 31, and accordingly does not render claims 10, 16, 30, and 31 obvious.

Claims 11-15 are also not obvious over the combination of En-Seung and Batten-Carew for at least the same reasons as independent claim 10, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Claims 16-22 are also not obvious over the combination of En-Seung and Batten-Carew for at least the same reasons as independent claim 16, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 10-22, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Salvador M. Bezos  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 60,889

Date: 20-NOV-08

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

doc #: 864876